



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/266,155 03/10/99 PRICE

B MRA-PT001

VOLPE AND KOENIG
400 ONE PENN CENTER
1617 JOHN F KENNEDY BLVD
PHILADELPHIA PA 19103

IM22/0227

EXAMINER

JUSKA, C

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1771

DATE MAILED: 02/27/01

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Interview Summary

Application No.
09/266,155

Applicant(s)

Price et al.

Examiner

Cheryl Juska

Group Art Unit

1771



All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Cheryl Juska

(3) _____

(2) Ruy Garcia-Zamor (Reg. No. 44,117) For Tony Volpe

(4) _____

Date of Interview Feb 23, 2001

Type: ☒ Telephonic ☐ Personal (copy is given to ☐ applicant ☐ applicant's representative).

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: ☐ Yes ☒ No. If yes, brief description:

Agreement ☐ was reached. ☒ was not reached.

Claim(s) discussed: 2, 3, 5, and 6

Identification of prior art discussed:

applicant's own admission in specification

Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

Rather than filing a formal response, as understood in the last Interview, Volpe filed a proposed amendment. I called to state that the proposed amendment would not overcome the 112, 2nd set forth in section 8 of the last Office Action or the prior art rejections. Since the invention appeared to be in the process, I suggested filing new method claims in a divisional application or amending the claims to a product-by-process format. In the latter case, a showing that the method steps effect the product in a manipulative sense must be made for said method limitations to be given patentable weight. We also discussed amending the claims to recite the structural differences between the present invention and the prior art, such as the polymer layer flowing into the carpet layer to create voids. We did not reach an agreement.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments, if available, which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments which would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

1. ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview.

Unless the paragraph above has been checked to indicate to the contrary, A FORMAL WRITTEN RESPONSE TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION IS NOT WAIVED AND MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a response to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW.

2. ☐ Since the Examiner's interview summary above (including any attachments) reflects a complete response to each of the objections, rejections and requirements that may be present in the last Office action, and since the claims are now allowable, this completed form is considered to fulfill the response requirements of the last Office action. Applicant is not relieved from providing a separate record of the interview unless box 1 above is also checked.


CHERYL JUSKA
PATENT EXAMINER

Examiner Note: You must sign and stamp this form unless it is an attachment to a signed Office action.